REMARKS

Claims 1- 20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 15, 16, 17, and 19 have been formally amended to clarify that the first identifier code being associated with a first entity is unused by entities different from the first entity for identifying the object in a commercial transaction. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, and specifically on page 1, lines 10 – 13. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

Rejection of Claims 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1- 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0059204) and further in view of Brown (U.S. Patent 6,430,541) These claims are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Claim 1 recites a method for determining identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities. A first message supporting a commercial transaction and including at least a first identifier code identifying an object is received. The first identifier code is associated with a first entity and unused by entities different from the first entity for identifying the object in the commercial transaction. The first identifier code is extracted from the received first message. Object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction is accumulated in a first database. A plurality of messages incorporating the extracted first identifier code is generated. The plurality of messages is for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including the first database. The databases link the first identifier code associated with the first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying the object. The different identifier codes are associated with the entities different to the first entity. The different identifier codes corresponding to the first identifier code in response to communicating said plurality of messages are received. These features are not shown or suggested in Harris alone or in combination with Brown.

Contrary to the present claimed invention, Harris discloses a translation system applicable to search queries performed by a user. Specifically,

Harris describes a method and system for providing distribution of a query to devices on a communications network using an application to create an SQL query dictionary customized to a subscriber's data sources. Thus, the application can access a subscriber's database and build a customized dictionary that can convert a natural language or keyword search query to a precise SQL query for the subscriber's database (see Abstract). However, this is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which addresses a problem entirely different than the problem addressed in Harris. The present claimed system remedies problems typically involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). Harris (with Brown) provides no recognition of the problem addressed by the claimed arrangement or of the advantages provided by the claimed system that "alleviates the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19). Specifically, Harris (with Brown) is not concerned with determining identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of different entities which are parties to a commercial transaction. Rather, Harris is a system for locating products during an internet data search (see Harris, para. [0007]). Thus, Harris (with Brown) neither discloses nor suggests "receiving a first message supporting a commercial transaction and including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity and **unused by entities different from said first entity for identifying said object in said commercial transaction**" as recited in claim 1 of present claimed invention. Therefore, the present claimed system is able to aid commercial transactions by integrating "identifiers" used by different entities for "accumulating...object identifier code mapping information" obtained from "entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction". Harris (with Brown), neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

Furthermore, the present claimed invention dynamically translates a code or identifier used by a first entity (such as a first company) to identify an object such as a product, service or resource, to multiple corresponding codes or identifiers used by another entity (such as other companies) using multiple code mapping databases (Application page 2 lines 15-17). The Office Action asserts that Harris (with Brown), in paragraph 0031 shows the claimed activity of "accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from message data". Contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, the corresponding text merely describes a dictionary generating a customized query based

on the received query information and the survey results for applying a search on a data source (Harris, para. 0031). Specifically, the customized query uses terminology, abbreviations and/or filters to improve the search of relevant information on a specific data source. This is wholly unlike the present invention which dynamically maps an identifier code associated with a first entity (such as a first company) to identify an object to multiple corresponding identifier codes associated with other different entities (such as other companies) using multiple code mapping databases. Thus, Harris (with Brown) neither discloses nor suggests "accumulating, in a first database, **object identifier code mapping information** from identifier codes derived from message data" as in the presented claimed invention to accomplish the above-stated goal.

Additionally, the Office Action contends that Harris, in paragraphs 0018, 0029, 0044, and 0065 shows the claimed activity of "generating a plurality of messages incorporating **said extracted first identifier code**, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to **corresponding said different identifier codes identify said object**, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity" as claimed in claim 1 of present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, the corresponding text merely describes a "broker" dictionary for receiving search requests and for broadcasting the request to other custom dictionaries known as broadcast dictionaries. The broker dictionary compiles search results from broadcast dictionaries into one single search result to be provided to the initial requestor. Harris describes that the data sources can be analyzed with regard to codes related to data (purchase codes, product codes, price codes etc). Thus, Harris (with Brown) is merely concerned with using terminology and/or abbreviation in a query for searching multiple data sources containing codes related to data. In contrast, the present claimed invention teaches a method of using a first identifier code of a single object for determining other identifier codes for **the object associated with a plurality of identifier codes** by a corresponding plurality of different entities. Specifically, the claimed method utilizes a "first identifier code being associated with a first entity and being **unrecognized by entities different to said first entity** in said commercial transaction". Harris (with Brown) provides no enabling motivation to modify the Harris system to obtain the claimed arrangement. The sections of Harris cited in the Rejection, clearly state that any search term entered will yield a result that that is known to other entities as the broker dictionary obtains the result from the various

broadcast dictionaries. Therefore, there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Harris (with Brown) that discloses or suggests "generating a plurality of messages incorporating **said extracted first identifier code**, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to **corresponding said different identifier codes identify said object**, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present claimed invention.

Further, in the present claimed invention multiple identifier code mapping databases "are advantageously updated using received identifier codes". The system advantageously **accumulates**, in a first database, **object identifier code mapping information** from identifier codes **derived from** data representing messages supporting **commercial transactions** and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction". The system also generates a "plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to **corresponding different identifier codes identify said object**, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity". These features are not shown or suggested in Harris (with Brown). Contrary to Harris (with Brown), the claimed system as shown in Figure 12 of the Application, for example, advantageously translates identifiers WITHIN messages as they pass through an interface processor (900), WITHOUT any action or knowledge thereof by either the sending system (700) or receiving system (710). This feature provides transparent and automated mapping of identifiers, WITHOUT requiring changes to either a sending or receiving application. Such is neither disclosed nor suggested by Harris (with Brown).

The system of Harris (with Brown) as shown in Figure 1 actively surveys a data source, depicted as a database engine (20), in order to build a mapping dictionary. This requires such databases to support queries from surveyor (102), which requires work on the database engine (20), access to the database engine, and detailed knowledge of the layout of the database (Harris paragraph 0029). The active surveying and communications involved in the Harris (with Brown) system are burdensome and employ processing, communication and bandwidth resources. The necessary connections between units 102 and 20 in Harris (with Brown) present a security risk and burden database engine 20. In contrast, the claimed system does not

require such an active surveying connection to databases in order to build a mapping dictionary, because it is able to *passively* survey *messages* supporting *commercial transactions* in communication on a network to build a mapping dictionary.

Thus, the claimed system, by "accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction", advantageously does not require an active connection between units (for example 102-20 in Harris) or a tight linkage to a database record layout (as in Harris). Thus, the present claimed system does not include the security risk associated with the Harris (with Brown) system. Furthermore, the surveying connection required by Harris (with Brown) results in the need to build, maintain, and effect customized queries and results (Harris, Fig. 1, 110, 112). The claimed system does not need to interact with either the sender (Application Fig. 7, 700) or receiver (Application Fig. 7, 710) databases as data sources and therefore is not burdened by the need to build and communicate such queries as required in Harris (with Brown). The present claimed system uses the "first database" created by "accumulating…object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes **derived from** data representing messages supporting commercial transactions". This feature is not shown or suggested in Harris (with Brown).

Brown et al. teaches a system for monitoring absent items from inventory and automatically transferring search requests to multiple independent product databases each respectively associated with one of multiple retailers. Specifically, the system includes a database of universal identifier for multiple on-line retailers. The on-line retailers are collected into the database according to certain criteria. However, Brown, similar to Harris, neither discloses nor suggests "receiving a first message supporting a commercial transaction and including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity and **unused by entities different from said first entity for identifying said object in said commercial transaction**" and "generating a plurality of messages incorporating **said extracted first identifier code**, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to **corresponding said different identifier codes identify said object**, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity" as recited in the present claimed invention.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there is no motivation to combine the system of Harris with the system of Brown in order to produce the present claimed invention. Harris describes a method for improving search capabilities of various database systems located across different networks. Brown is concerned with inventory purchases according to inventory needs. These references are responsive to different problems and thus it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these references to produce the present claimed invention would not be obvious.

Furthermore, even if these systems were combined they would not produce the system as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention. Specifically, the combination of these references neither discloses nor suggests a method including the activities of "receiving a first message supporting a commercial transaction and including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity and **unused by entities different from said first entity for identifying said object in said commercial transaction**", "accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to **effect a commercial transaction**" and "generating a plurality of messages incorporating **said extracted first identifier code**, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to **corresponding different identifier codes identify said object**, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity" as in the present claimed invention. Instead the combined system of Harris and Brown provides a system for querying a plurality of different data sources for monitoring inventory. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention and provides no recognition of the problem addressed by the present claimed invention. Specifically, the present claimed invention addresses the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references when taken alone or in combination.

Independent claims 15, 16, 17 and 19 include the similar patentable limitation as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 15, 16, 17 and 19 are not obvious in view of Harris and Brown when taken alone or in combination. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 15, 16, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Harris and Brown, alone or in combination, provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that makes the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 15, 16, 17, and 19 unpatentable. As claims 2 – 14 are dependent on claim 1, claim 18 is dependent on claim 17 and claim 20 is dependent on claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 – 14, 18 and 20 are also not made unpatentable by Harris and Brown when taken alone or in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2006

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030